

Date: Sun, 6 Mar 94 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #103
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 6 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 103

Today's Topics:

 Andorra
 CW
 CW (2)
 Getting an US license.
 I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW
 Morse Whiners (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Mar 94 21:26:27 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!pacbell.com!sgiblab!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-
state.edu!jussieu.fr!univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Andorra
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well,

Andorra has ceased delivering any licenses, temporary or permanent.
Therefore, there won't be any new C3 indicatives.

The situation won't change till at best next year, the governement of
Andorra seem to have little to do with hams.

Vincent, after a phone call to the URA (Unio de Radioficiones Andorrans)

Date: 3 Mar 94 23:44:09 GMT
From: lerc.nasa.gov!news.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@purdue.edu
Subject: CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CLz66M.Lp0@freenet.carleton.ca>, Maria L. Evans
(ap164@FreeNet.Carleton.CA) writes:

>
>
>However...do I think I HAVE to have that skill to be a "real" ham?
>No. I'm a "real" ham because I know enough about radio theory to
>solder a connector, make a dipole, climb a tower. Now, that may
>not be everyone's definition, but it's MINE...for me.
>

Ouch! I know you were trying to be brief, but what you've described in no way justifies our occupation of 10% of the spectrum below 1.3GHz. The notion of us all defining for ourselves what a ham is doesn't accomplish anything. The only question that matters is what are we doing with our spectrum to justify our continued occupation of it. I believe that technical exploration and education is the best justification we have, followed by our ability to be a parallel communications asset for emergencies and other unusual circumstances.

I believe CW is an asset in both of these cases. In the first case, specifically, I think a person can build a *useful* CW station much easier than building a *useful* SSB station. Whether CW is enough of an asset to be a requirement is a legitimate question to debate. When people say "I just want to get on phone", or "other digital modes are more reliable than CW", one follow-up question I don't hear is "At what expense?" All this gear that people want to use instead of CW is *expensive*. Are we going to make this exclusively a rich person's hobby? Where does that leave the young beginner with lots of interest but not much money? Realistically, if the CW requirement were removed for HF, the CW portions of the bands would shrink due to pressure from the no-coders. Anyone who doesn't believe this doesn't know the history of the band allocations. Will this be another case of money squeezing out enthusiasm?

73,
Mike, KK6GM

Date: 4 Mar 94 00:31:39 GMT
From: lerc.nasa.gov!news.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@purdue.edu

Subject: CW (2)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar1.014831.24074@mixcom.mixcom.com>, kevin jessup
(kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) writes:
>In <2D726467@msmail.uthscsa.edu> MUENZLERK@uthscsa.EDU (Muenzler, Kevin) writes:
>
>
>>I think that CW is the very basis of amateur radio
>>and should
>>always be that way.
>
>Geez!! Why do I even bother??

Only you can answer that...

>In 30 years (probably closer to 15) CW, HF and possibly even VHF will be
>dead and buried. They will remain only for those incapable of comprehending
>and using the computer network based multimedia systems
>that will provide both local AND global communication.

Ham radio should not strive to become some kind of parallel AT&T. It
should be a learning ground. Remember that the hottest military and
commercial pilots learn their fundamentals in low-tech two-seaters.

>BTW, the "basis" of amateur radio is the fact that an RF wave can be
>modulated (using a wide range of methods) so as to convey information.

We'll get back to this...

>>I don't mean to insult any of the no-code techs out
>>there,
>
>I'm not insulted or angered. After a night of reading amateur.policy,
>my emotions range from frustration, to amazement to uncontrollable
>fits of laughter.

No argument there.

>> but I think
>>that it was a mistake for the FCC to remove CW as a requirement for a
>>license.
>
>The problem was not the elimination of the CW requirement but the "dumbing
>down" of the theory tests. The fact that CW remained as a stop-gap measure
>is no reason for it's continued use. The theory tests should be entirely
>reworked so as to be both tougher and to cover a wider range of disciplines

Date: 4 Mar 94 21:36:05 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!news.msfc.nasa.gov!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

>In article <064307Z23021994@anon.penet.fi>,
>Dan Pickersgill <an64930@anon.penet.fi> wrote:
>>I want my EXTRA class permit NOW! - I'm far too busy to work for it.
>>Don't you dare ask me to learn your CW, I'm far too important for that.
>>I've been waiting 3 years for you to change your rules to let me in, isn't
>>that long enough? Send it now and I'll stop whining to everybody.
>>Call me codeless in Ohio.

>It's not an Extra Class "permit," Dan. It's an Extra Class License.

>You've been waiting three years? WHAT have you been doing, since you
>obviously haven't been working on your upgrade. Ah...let me guess.
>You've been posting in rec.radio.amateur.policy. And whining.

Ahhh, someone was obviously fooled by the bogus posting from across
the pond! One day, I should look through the dictionary to find the
meaning of "clueless."

Kok Chen, AA6TY
Apple Computer, Inc.

kchen@apple.com

Date: 4 Mar 1994 20:59:56 GMT
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!sw.stratus.com!fms@yale.arpa
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:
> dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:
> [...]
> > Now most of these people also have spent their time upgrading to higher
> > license classes. Perhaps you only want to count those who steadfastly
> > refuse to advance their license class? We have LOTS of people who enter
> > the hobby through no-code and do advance. They are also making technical

> > contributions.

>

> I wouldn't count them, because the idea behind the nocode license was
> it was for people who "didn't" want to do the code. People to take the
> nocode license as their entry-level license test and continue to upgrade
> aren't really "no code" technicians, just as the person who entered the
> hobby via the Novice license wouldn't be considered a "novice". Its
> simply a matter of which entry-level license they chose, and most choose
> the no-code tech, because its easier to study all theory in one shot
> and then study all cw, rather than dividing your time between the two.

>

> Since the no-code license was designed for people who were never
> going to upgrade past their tech license (no interest in cw, after
> all...), then yes, I think you should limit examples to people who
> fall within that license class currently.

>

It's curious that you should consider things this way.

This past weekend, I attended ARRL Night at one of the radio club meetings in our section. Our Division Director (Hi Bill!), who spoke on many interesting topics over the span of the evening, at one point asked how many people in the room were Technicians.

Despite the fact that I've held a higher license class for two years now (and have held a higher license class for longer than I had my Tech), I almost raised my hand.

I mentioned this to a few other former Techs after the meeting, and we all agreed that, despite the fact that we have upgraded, we still think of ourselves as Technicians. In fact, we all still think of ourselves as Codeless Technicians. I passed the code long before my license ever arrived, but I still think of myself that way. I still have intentions of upgrading to Extra someday, but even then, I suspect I'll still think of myself as a Tech.

My personal feeling on the topic in question is that the no-code Technician license was put into place to bring in those people who were not interested in learning the code in order to come into the hobby, the hope being that some good technical people would come in as part of that crowd. If these people then decide to move up the amateur ranks, why should we discount their accomplishments? Sounds like reverse discrimination to me -- you don't like codeless Techs unless they accomplish something, but they'd better not upgrade before they accomplish it, or else it doesn't count...

73 de Faith N1JIT

--

Faith M. Senie

InterNet: fms@vos.stratus.com

Stratus Computer, Inc. InterNet: fms@hoop.sw.stratus.com
55 Fairbanks Blvd. Pkt Radio: n1jit@walphy.ma.usa.na
Marlboro, MA 01752 Phone: (508)460-2632

Curiosity doesn't flourish among the burned-out...

Date: 4 Mar 94 21:41:08 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!mvp.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!news.msfc.nasa.gov!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!@
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar4.010112.13806@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> writes:

|> BTW Mike you asked me for technical innovations a couple weeks ago, and I
|> don't have the answer. But before you claim victory, I think I would
|> like to hear about the innovations that have been made in the CW
|> subbands.

Don't worry, I can't quote any either. Unless, of course, I wanted to
spend my time researching the matter, which I don't. However, its safe
to assume that all technological innovations through Feb 1991 were
implemented by coded hams.

|> What does grippe me is when someone like Robert Coyle or you looks down
|> their nose because I'm just a no clue.

I don't look down on non-coded techs. There are many non-coded techs in
the area that I treat like I would any other Extra, Advanced, or Novice.
I look down at CB transplants who get on the two meter good-buddy box
and make comments like "I've gotta back on outta here and get off the
super-slab to pick up some motion lotion".

|> Of course armed with your pretty
|> government issued serial number (read extra class license) you now can
|> claim to be better than someone else.

Actually, I'm only an Advanced class. I have neither the time nor
inkling to bother to upgrade to Extra when all it buys me is a few
kc's of bandwidth. I don't like code that much :-)

|> I expect that you will
|> maintain that status until the requirement for high speed code is dropped

|> and then you will be just another fish in the pond.

Actually, I'll always know I'm better, because I can do one thing that they can't: copy code.

|> Just so I'm not miss quoted, I would like to see the requirement for
|> high speed code dropped. I would like to see a meaningful test that
|> tests for operations knowledge and technical knowledge.
|> see an emphases on emergency operations.

Then we are pretty much in agreement, as I want to see reduced code requirements (but still keep them) and a two-tiered licensing system with a single, comprehensive theory examination which covers everything the 5 theory exams cover today, plus more.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-2668

Date: 5 Mar 94 07:06:42 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <762760732snx@skyld.grendel.com> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

>

>In article <CM492M.BC1@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu writes:

>

> > Is the following 'bragging'? -----+

> > |

> > |

> > \||/ <- body part?

> >

I bet you look at tall buildings with admiration, Jeff#2.

> No, I see nothing in there to get all fired up about. Bragging implies that
> you've done something worth noting.

Tell that to the other fellow - he's the one who said I was bragging.

> By the way, congratulations on exceeding the established usenet guidelines
> for civilized .sig files.

By the way, congratulations on exceeding the established usenet guidelines
for uncivilized articles.

I've seen much worse sigs than mine. Besides, as you know, I usually use just:

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 4 Mar 94 21:21:17 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!news.msfc.nasa.gov!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!swrinde!sgiblab!brunix!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2l210g\$3sd@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<willmore.762720002@metropolis.gis.iastate.edu>, <2l6af8\$f59@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: CW

In article <2l6af8\$f59@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

|> By the way, this is the reason why those who have claimed "handicap waivers"
|> cannot be VEs.

Is this actually codified in Part 97? I could swear that I know of at least
one handicap-waiver no-code Extra who is a VE.

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-2668

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #103
